UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,765	05/15/2006	Daniel Wigdor	03-930-E	7397
	7590 05/21/2009 BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP		EXAMINER	
300 S. WACKER DRIVE			WALSH, DANIEL I	
32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2887	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/560,765	WIGDOR, DANIEL		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	DANIEL WALSH	2887		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutorion. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 M</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 18-28 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 18-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 25-28 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subjected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and are subjected to by the Examin and/or are subjected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and or are subjected to by the Examin are subjected to be subjected to by the Examin are subjected to be sub	ewn from consideration. or election requirement. er. cepted or b) objected to by the l			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5-12-09.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2887

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 18-23, 25, and 27 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 18: Replace all instances of "tilt" with – mobile phone tilt – and replace all instances of "tilt state" with – tilt state of the mobile phone --.

Re claim 19: Replace "tilt state" with – tilt state of the mobile phone --.

Re claim 20: Replace "tilt" with – mobile phone tilt –

Re claim 21: Replace "tilt" with – mobile phone tilt –

Re claim 22: Replace "tilt" with – mobile phone tilt –

Re claim 23: Replace "tilt" with – mobile phone tilt –

Re claim 25: Replace "tilt" with – mobile phone tilt –

Re claim 27: Replace "tilt" with – mobile phone tilt –

Appropriate correction is requested.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPO 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2887

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 18-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 34- 39 of copending Application No. 11944284. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current application is a broader recitation.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

For example, claim 18 of the current application recites: "...sampling tilt along two axes...sample stack... first button... tilt state... first threshold... second threshold... third threshold... fourth threshold...", whereas claim 34 of the '284 Application recites: "sampling tilt along two axes... sample stack... first button... tilt state... first threshold... second threshold... third threshold... fourth threshold...".

Claims 19-23 of the current application recite, respectively, : " ... fifth threshold ... ", " ... lower case ... ", " ... microprocessor ... ", " ... acceleration ... ", " ... digital camera ... ", " ... left side ... ", and wherein in the '284 Application, claims 35- 39 recite, respectively, : " ... fifth threshold ... ", " ... lower case ... ", " ... microprocessor ... ", " ... acceleration ... ", " ... digital camera ... ", " ... left side ... ".

Application/Control Number: 10/560,765 Page 4

Art Unit: 2887

Re claim 24, though silent to the mobile phone structure, the Examiner notes that the claimed lactations are conventional in the art for a mobile phone layout, and therefore are an obvious expedient for ease of use and acceptance.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claims 25-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 4. The reasons for allowance have been discussed in the previous Office Action.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (See US 7389591 where the Examiner notes that Jaiswal et al. appears to teach the claim limitations, including an equivalent means to the sample stack, as Jaiswal et al. teaches that the processor tilt sensor and memory communicate to determine a common neutral position based on the average position of the device 500 whenever the control is ordinarily selected, which is interpreted as using past samples (in memory) to average to determine tilt state. Jaiswal et al. teaches moving the phone after button pressing to select characters, numbers, case, as claimed, but Jaiswal et al. does not constitute prior art due to its effective date.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL WALSH whose telephone number is (571)272-2409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-7pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/560,765 Page 5

Art Unit: 2887

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Paik can be reached on 571-272-2404. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DANIEL WALSH/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2887